

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits a certified copy of the priority document. Acknowledgement is requested.

All claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner particularly complains that the claims are “generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.” Claims 1-14 have been canceled in favor of new claims 15-29. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unanticipated by U.S. 6,829,243 to Sundhar. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish that a claim is anticipated, the Examiner must point out where each and every limitation in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentec, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Every limitation contained in the claims must be present in the reference, and if even one limitation is missing from the reference, then it does not anticipate the claim. *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Sundhar fails to satisfy this rigorous standard.

Sundhar provides directory assistance for IP client telephones in selectable formats. For example, in response to an audio directory request from the client, a directory assistance response in both audio format and text data format are provided. Alternatively, in response to a text message directory assistance request from the client, a text data format is provided in response. Sundhar discloses a gatekeeper 30 and H.323 gateways.

The instant claims are not directed to directory assistance but rather to operation and administration of multi-user real time application programs in a networked computer system. Example applications include multi-media conferencing applications, multi-player games, multi-user white boarding, etc. Client users are provided with part of the application and communicate with a remaining part of the application called the server. Typically, non-standard, customized protocols are used to exchange information between the client and the server because each shared applications have its own specific needs. But having each multi-user application use its own customized protocol presents a significant problem to an administrator trying to perform common administration to support several different multi-user applications. Examples of administration functions are listed on page 2 of the application. It is also difficult to enable different multi-user application protocols to pass through a firewall. Although it would be desirable to use a standardized call control protocol for multi-user clients/server communications, such standard control protocols are based on codecs that are optimized for voice, video, or other non real-time data transfer. In short, these codecs are not suitable for transporting real-time data.

The inventors solved these problems. A standard protocol is used, such as H.323 protocol or SIP protocol. Each client and server includes a new codec functionality that permits real-time data transfer within the context of standard H.323 and SIP communication protocols. An example of such a real-time codec in an H.323 context is provided on page 6 of the application. In this non-limiting example, the codec uses real-time transport protocol (RTP) over user datagram protocol (UDP) to obtain real-time transport. Two types of messages--a data message and a control message--are used. Data messages can be sent from the client or from the server while control messages are only sent from the server. A Type field is used to identify

whether the message is a data message or control message. During the standardized H.323 call set-up phase, both the client and the server inform each other of which transport protocol is to be used. This information may be used by an H.323 Proxy to enable the chosen data protocol to be transferred to a firewall as illustrated in Fig. 3. It is advantageous to employ an H.323 Proxy to deal with firewalls and with network address translation (NAT) often used by enterprises for sharing one single IP address. A list of example functions that may be performed by the H.323 Proxy is listed on page 10.

Although H.323 systems provide an authentication procedure, that procedure only specifies how the user name and password can be sent from an end-user to the gatekeeper. But to obtain true authentication, a user database is added to the gatekeeper in order to provide a mechanism to check the user name against the password. The database includes a record for each user containing the user name and password, and the gatekeeper can then check the database to see if the password for the end-user matches the password received from the end-user.

Sundhar lacks multiple claim features. First, Sundhar fails to disclose an H.323 or SIP Proxy as recited in each of the independent claims. Second, Sundhar does not disclose a user handling database associated with the gatekeeper to check a user profile to obtain from the database to determine whether the client is allowed to set up a call to the server. Third, Sundhar also fails to disclose enhancing the H.323 protocol or SIP protocol using a real-time codec included with the client and server for establishing a real-time data transfer. Fourth, as recited in claims 15 and 16, Sundhar does not teach that each real-time codec supports a data communications protocol other than the H.323 protocol or the SIP protocol employed by the client and the server to operate the client/server multi-user computer application.

BACH CORNELIUSSEN

Appl. No. 10/037,487

June 14, 2005

Lacking multi-features in the claims, the anticipation of rejection based on Sundhar should be withdrawn. The Examiner is requested to examine at least each of the independent claims as a separate claim since the independent claims are not identical.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



John R. Lastova

Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:sd

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100